	Case 3.03-cv-00343-3vv Documen	it II Thed 00/01/07 Page 1 0/3
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	CHARLES NEWMAN,	) No. C 05-00343 JW (PR)
12	Petitioner,	ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR A WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS
13	VS.	
14	RICHARD KIRKLAND, Warden,	
15	Respondent.	
16		<i>,</i> -
17		
United S	tates. Districtioner ta California state pr	risoner currently incarcerated at the Corcoran
19	State Prison, filed a <u>pro</u> <u>se</u> petition for a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C.	
20	§ 2254, alleging he was deprived of half-time credits in violation of due process.	
21	The Court found the petition, liberally construed, stated a potentially cognizable	
22	claim under § 2254 and ordered respondent to show cause why the petition should	
23	not be granted. Respondent filed an answer and petitioner filed a traverse.	
24		
25	BACKGROUND	
26	Petitioner alleges that for the period August 13, 2002 to December 10, 2003,	
27	Ouden Denvine Detition for a Write CVI 1 C	
28	Order Denying Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus P:\PRO-SE\SJ.JW\HC.05\Newman343_deny.wpd	

2 3

1

4 5

> 6 7 8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

20 21

19

23

22

24 25

26

27

28

Order Denying Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus P:\PRO-SE\SJ.JW\HC.05\Newman343\_deny.wpd

he was placed on the full time job waiting list. Petitioner claims that being on the waiting list entitled him under California law to receive three months sentence credit for every six months served, or in other words half-time credit, but that he was not given such credit.

Petitioner alleges that he exhausted his administrative remedies. He also claims that he filed a state habeas petition with the California Supreme Court, which was denied on December 15, 2004. Petitioner filed the instant federal habeas petition on January 25, 2005.

## **DISCUSSION**

State prisoners who wish to challenge the computation of their time credits must do so in a petition for a writ of habeas corpus, because a favorable determination of the claim would likely result in entitlement to an earlier release. See Butterfield v. Bail, 120 F.3d 1023, 1024 (9th Cir. 1997); Young v. Kenny, 907 F.2d 874, 876-78 (9th Cir. 1990); see also Ramirez v. Galaza, 334 F.3d 850, 858-59 (9th Cir. 2003) (noting where claim, if successful, would "necessarily" or "likely" accelerate prisoner's release on parole, claim is properly brought by way of habeas

## United & tates District Court

This court may entertain a petition for a writ of habeas corpus "in behalf of a person in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court only on the ground that he is in custody in violation of the Constitution or laws or treaties of the United States." 28 U.S.C. § 2254(a).

Respondent is correct that petitioner's claim that he is entitled to receive credits under California law is not cognizable in a federal habeas petition. A writ of habeas corpus is available "only on the basis of some transgression of federal law binding on the state courts." Middleton v. Cupp, 768 F.2d 1083, 1085 (9th Cir.

1985). It is unavailable for violations of state law or for alleged error in the interpretation or application of state law. See Estelle v. McGuire, 502 U.S. 62, 67-68 (1991). Here, as noted, petitioner alleges that state officials have misapplied state law in calculating work credits.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, as the petition does not claim a violation of federal law, the petition is hereby DISMISSED for failure to state a cognizable claim for federal habeas relief. See 28 U.S.C. § 2254(a). **CONCLUSION** The petition for a writ of habeas corpus is DISMISSED for failing to state a cognizable claim for federal habeas relief under 28 U.S.C. § 2254(a). DATED: June 1, 2007 United States District Judge United States District Court 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Petitioner's claim still fails on the merits as it appears from the record of his administrative appeals that petitioner was in fact given the half-time credits, i.e., one day of credit for each two days served, which he claims he did not receive. See Computation Review Hearing Decision (Pet. Ex. G, February 20, 2003); see also Director's Level Appeal Decision (Pet. Ex. J, May 12, 2003).